

CONVERGENCE OF SINGULAR LIMITS FOR MULTI-D SEMILINEAR HYPERBOLIC SYSTEMS TO PARABOLIC SYSTEMS

DONATELLA DONATELLI AND PIERANGELO MARCATI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we investigate the zero-relaxation limit of the following multi-D semilinear hyperbolic system in pseudodifferential form:

$$W_t(x, t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} A(x, D)W(x, t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} B(x, W(x, t)) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D(W(x, t)) + E(W(x, t)).$$

We analyse the singular convergence, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, in the case which leads to a limit system of parabolic type. The analysis is carried out by using the following steps:

- (i) We single out algebraic “structure conditions” on the full system, motivated by formal asymptotics, by some examples of discrete velocity models in kinetic theories.
- (ii) We deduce “energy estimates”, uniformly in ε , by assuming the existence of a symmetrizer having the so called block structure and by assuming “dissipativity conditions” on B .
- (iii) We perform the convergence analysis by using generalizations of Compensated Compactness due to Tartar and Gérard.

Finally we include examples which show how to use our theory to approximate prescribed general quasilinear parabolic systems, satisfying Petrowski parabolicity condition, or general reaction diffusion systems.

Key words and phrases: Hyperbolic systems, parabolic systems, pseudodifferential operators, relaxation theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the following semilinear multidimensional hyperbolic system with a small parameter $\varepsilon > 0$

$$(1.1) \quad W_t(x, t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} A(x, D)W(x, t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} B(x, W(x, t)) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D(W(x, t)) + E(W(x, t)),$$

where $W = W(x, t)$ belongs to $\mathbb{R}^N$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \geq 0$, $A(x, D)$ is a first order pseudodifferential operator. The system (1.1) includes also the case of hyperbolic differential operators of the form

$$(1.2) \quad W_t(x, t) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^d A_j(x) \partial_j W(x, t) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} B(x, W(x, t)) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D(W(x, t)) + E(W(x, t)),$$

where $A_j(x)$, $j = 1, \dots, d$ are $N \times N$ matrices for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Our aim is to describe the limiting behaviour of the system (1.1) as ε goes to zero. We look for structure condition to ensure that (1.1) approximate a second order parabolic system. Our interest in this problem is motivated also by a very strong similarity with the limiting structure appearing in the investigation of the hydrodynamic limit for the Boltzmann equation, in particular in the discrete velocity case. The

Boltzmann equation describes the evolution of the density $f(x, \xi, t)$ of particles which are at time t in position x with velocity ξ and has the following form

$$\nu f_t + \xi \nabla \cdot f = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} Q(f, f)$$

where ν is the Mach number and ε the Knudsen number. By averaging $f(x, \xi, t)$ in ξ and by using higher order momenta we can define a hierarchy of macroscopic quantities. The investigation of the hydrodynamic limit regards the behaviour of those quantities (actually combined with the closure problem) as the Knudsen number goes to zero. In the case where the Mach number is of the same order of the Knudsen number our limit can be described by the Navier Stokes equation, otherwise when the Mach number is fixed and the Knudsen number tends to zero we end up with the Euler equation. Those limits allow us to understand the differences between relaxation limits of hyperbolic type to parabolic with respect to those one of hyperbolic to hyperbolic type [2], [16], [17], [18], [28], [50], [12]. In particular if we deal with a discrete velocity models, the equivalent “ Boltzmann equation” is a semilinear hyperbolic system. The simplest example is given by the Carleman’s equation

$$\begin{cases} f_{1t} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} f_{1x} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} (f_2^2 - f_1^2) \\ f_{2t} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} f_{2x} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} (f_1^2 - f_2^2), \end{cases}$$

where we take $\xi \in \{-1, 1\}$ and $f_1 = f(x, 1, t)$, $f_2 = f(x, -1, t)$. By rescaling the variable we get that $\rho = f_1 + f_2$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ satisfies the nonlinear diffusion equation

$$\rho_t = \frac{1}{2} (\log \rho)_{xx}.$$

This asymptotic problem was first investigated by Kurtz [21] and McKean [36]. Therefore the nonlinear diffusion problem, obtained as the limit of the Cattaneo hyperbolic nonlinear heat conduction equation, was proved by Marcati, Milani and Secchi [32]. The paper of Marcati and Milani [31] concerns the porous media flow as the limit of the Euler equation in 1-D, later generalized by Marcati and Rubino [35] to the multi-D case. Relaxation phenomena of the same nature appear in the zero relaxation limits for the Euler-Poisson model for the semiconductor devices and it was investigated by Marcati and Natalini [33], [34] in the 1-D case and by Lattanzio and Marcati [22] in the multi-D case. More recently Lions and Toscani [27] investigated a discrete velocity model leading to the porous media flow. All of these papers, with exception of [21], [36], make use of the techniques of compensated compactness. Similar ideas have been applied by Marcati and Rubino [35] to show the general theory for 2×2 systems in the 1-D case and to propose a general framework that we are going to investigate here in the semilinear system case. Models of BGK type approximation have been successfully studied in this framework by Bouchut, Guarguaglini and Natalini [1] and Lattanzio, Natalini [23] in the case of 1-D systems. The framework of [35] was also investigated in the quasilinear case by Lattanzio and Yong [24] for H^s - smooth solutions. Recently, with a similar approach, Junk and Yong [15] derived the incompressible Navier Stokes equations from the BGK model. Preliminary results concerning semilinear systems have been obtained in [7], [8], in particular in [8] we considered a 1- D semilinear system with variable coefficients. Already in that case the classical compensated compactness is

not sufficient and it is necessary to use a generalization of this theory due to Tartar [46] and P.G  rard [11]. From the technical point of view the problem, here, has additional complications, since we deal with a multi- D pseudodifferential system and since the symmetrizers are pseudodifferential operators.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we give the basic definitions, the basic notations and we recall some mathematical tools needed in this paper. In Section 3 we describe the structure condition on our system and on its symmetrizers and we will describe the formal framework of the limiting process. The Section 4 is devoted to give rigorous proof of the previous formal analysis, the assumptions of the previous section will allow us to obtain the a priori estimates of energy type uniformly in ε . By using only the informations coming from the energy estimates and by means of the previous mentioned compactness framework we will be able to obtain our relaxation results. The structure conditions used in the limit process allow us also to satisfy the parabolicity condition for the limit system in the case of system (1.2). In Section 5 we show how this theory can be greatly simplified in the case of constant coefficients. Finally, in Section 6 we show how it is possible to use the theory developed in the previous sections in order to approximate a given parabolic system by means of a larger hyperbolic system with simpler nonlinear structure. We are able to approximate the following nonlinear parabolic systems in divergence form

$$U_t + \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i \left(F_i(U) - \sum_{j=1}^d B_{ij}(U) \partial_j U \right) = G(U)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $U = U(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$. With the previous techniques we approximate also reaction- diffusion systems of the form

$$U_t = \sum_{j,k=1}^d A_{j,k}(x) \partial_j \partial_k U + f(U)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $U = U(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$. In this latter case we use two different approach. The former is based on the theory of pseudodifferential operators while the latter is based on symmetric differential operators and can be more usefull for numerical computations. Let us remark that this latter approximation extends in multi-D those proposed by Jin and Liu [14] and Lattanzio and Natalini [23] (example 5.3). Our theory does not require the use of L^∞ estimates (for instance via invariant domains like Serre [43]).

2. PRELIMINARY NOTIONS

We start this section introducing the main notations and definitions used in this article. In particular we recall some basic facts and notations concerning the theory of pseudodifferential operators and we also recall our main compactness tools used in the strong convergence analysis. Namely

- (a) $(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the scalar product in $\mathbb{R}^q$, ($q = 1, 2, \dots$) and $|\cdot|$ the usual norm of $\mathbb{R}^q$ ($q = 1, 2, \dots$),
- (b) $\mathcal{M}_{m \times n}$ denotes the linear space of $m \times n$ matrices,
- (c) $(\cdot, \cdot)_2$ denotes the scalar product in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\|\cdot\|$ the norm in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$,
- (d) $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ denotes the space of test function $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$, $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ the Schwarz space of distributions and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the duality bracket in $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$,

- (e) H is a separable Hilbert space, $\mathcal{L}(H)$ the space of bounded operators, $\mathcal{K}(H)$ the space of compact operators,
- (f) we denote by $H_{loc}^s(\Omega, H)$ the classical local Sobolev space of order s , i.e. $u \in H_{loc}^s(\Omega, H) \iff \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty, (\widehat{\varphi u}) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n, (1 + |\xi|^2)^s d\xi)$.
- (g) we denote by $F_\nu(Z^I, Z^{II})$ the derivative respect to the variable Z^{II} of $F(Z^I, Z^{II})$.

We shall also make use of the notion of parabolicity for systems of equations in various way (see Taylor [49] volume III, [48], Eidel'man [9], Kreiss and Lorenz [20]). Let us consider the following system

$$(2.1) \quad u_t = \sum_{j,k} A^{j,k}(t, x, D'_x u) \partial_j \partial_k u + B(t, x, D'_x u),$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $A^{j,k}(t, x, D'_x u) \in \mathcal{M}_{p \times p}$, $B(t, x, D'_x u) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and D'_x is a differential operator of order not greater than two. The system is said *strongly parabolic* if there exists $c_0 > 0$, such that for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ one has

$$\sum_{j,k} A^{j,k}(t, x, D'_x u) \xi_j \xi_k \geq c_0 |\xi|^2 I.$$

Namely, if we denote $L(t, x, D'_x u, \xi) = - \sum_{j,k} A^{j,k}(t, x, D'_x u) \xi_j \xi_k$ this condition is

equivalent to say $L + L^T$ is a negative definite matrix. Unfortunately, this condition is often difficult to be verified, then we recall a more general notion often referred as *Petrowski parabolicity* (see Taylor [49] volume III, [48]).

We say that the system (2.1) is *parabolic* if, denoted by $\lambda_k(t, x, D'_x u, \xi)$ the eigenvalues of the matrix $L(t, x, D'_x u, \xi)$, one has there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\operatorname{Re} \lambda_k(t, x, D'_x u, \xi) \leq -\alpha_0 |\xi|^2.$$

The latter notion of parabolicity is equivalent to ask the existence of a symmetric matrix $P_0(t, x, D'_x u, \xi)$, positive definite (i.e. $P_0 \geq cI > 0$), homogeneous of degree 0 in ξ , such that

$$-(P_0 L + L^* P_0) \geq c |\xi|^2 I > 0.$$

Let us recall the basic notations concerning pseudodifferential operators to be used later on, we refer to [48] for details. Assuming $\rho, \delta \in [0, 1]$, $m \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote $S_{\rho, \delta}^m$ the set of C^∞ symbols satisfying

$$|D_x^\beta D_\xi^\alpha p(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha, \beta} \langle \xi \rangle^{m - \rho|\alpha| + \delta|\beta|}$$

for all α, β , where $\langle \xi \rangle = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{1/2}$. In such case we say that the associated operator defined by

$$P(x, D)f(x) = \int p(x, \xi) \hat{f}(\xi) e^{ix\xi} d\xi := OP(p(x, \xi))$$

(where $\hat{f}(\xi) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int f(x) e^{-ix\xi} dx$ denotes the Fourier transform of the function f) belongs to $OPS_{\rho, \delta}^m$. If there are smooth symbols $p_{m-j}(x, \xi)$, homogeneous in ξ of degree $m - j$ for $|\xi| \geq 1$, i.e. $p_{m-j}(x, r\xi) = r^{m-j} p_{m-j}(x, \xi)$ for $r, |\xi| \geq 1$, and if

$$p(x, \xi) \sim \sum_{j \geq 0} p_{m-j}(x, \xi)$$

in the sense that

$$p(x, \xi) - \sum_{j \geq 0}^N p_{m-j}(x, \xi) \in S_{1,0}^{m-N}$$

for all N , then we say $p(x, \xi) \in S^m$. We define also

$$S^{-\infty} = \bigcap_{m > 0} S_{\rho, \delta}^{-m}.$$

The following properties will also be used here.

Theorem 2.1. ([48], Theorem 0.5 A) *If $P(x, D) \in OPS_{\rho, \delta}^0$ and $0 \leq \delta < \rho \leq 1$ then*

$$P(x, D) : L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \longrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

Theorem 2.2. ([47], Chapter II, Lemma 6.2 Ex.8.1, Chapter III, Proposition 3.1) *If $P(x, D) \in OPS_{\rho, \delta}^0$, $\delta < \rho$ and if $\Re p(x, \xi) \geq c > 0$ then there exists $\tilde{R}(x, D) \in OPS_{\rho, \delta}^0$ such that $\tilde{R}(x, D) \geq \eta I > 0$, with $\Re P(x, D) = \frac{1}{2}(P + P^*)$,*

$$\Re P(x, D) - \tilde{R}(x, D) \in OPS^{-\infty}.$$

Proposition 2.3. (Commutator estimate) ([48], Proposition 3.6 B) *Given $P(x, D) \in OPS_{1,0}^0$ we have*

$$\|[P, f]u\|_{W^{\sigma, p}} \leq c \|f\|_{Lip} \|u\|_{W^{\sigma-1, p}} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \sigma \leq 1,$$

in particular if $\sigma = 0$ and $p = 2$

$$\|[P, f]u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq c \|f\|_{Lip} \|u\|_{H^{-1}}.$$

Finally we state here our main tool, due to Tartar and Gérard ([46], [11]), to study the convergence of quadratic forms with variable coefficients. The classical results concerning the use of Compensated Compactness in the theory of hyperbolic systems are reported in the books of Dafermos [6] and Serre [42]. Let $H, H^\sharp$ denote separable Hilbert spaces, $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$, an open set, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We have the following theorem taken from Gérard [11].

Theorem 2.4. (Compensated Compactness)

Let $P \in OPS^m$ with principal symbol $p(x, \xi)$ and $\{u_k\}$ be a bounded sequence of $L_{loc}^2(\Omega, H)$, such that $u_k \rightharpoonup u$. Assume that there exists a dense subset $D \in H^\sharp$ such that, for any $h \in D$, the sequence $(\langle Pu_k, h \rangle)$ is relatively compact in $H_{loc}^{-m}(\Omega)$. Moreover, let $q \in C(\Omega, \mathcal{K}(H))$.

(i) *If $q = q^*$ and for all $(x, \xi, h) \in \Omega \times S^{n-1} \times H$, one has*

$$(p(x, \xi)h = 0) \Rightarrow (\langle q(x)h, h \rangle \geq 0)$$

then, for any nonnegative $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \varphi \langle q(x)u_k, u_k \rangle dx \geq \int_{\Omega} \varphi \langle q(x)u, u \rangle dx.$$

(ii) If for all $(x, \xi, h) \in \Omega \times S^{n-1} \times H$, one has

$$(p(x, \xi)h = 0) \Rightarrow (\langle q(x)h, h \rangle = 0)$$

then

$$\langle q(x)u_k, u_k \rangle \quad \text{converges to} \quad \langle q(x)u, u \rangle \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega).$$

The previous theorem holds also if instead of a differential operator $P \in OPS^m$ we consider the differential operator

$$Pu(x) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \partial^\alpha (a_\alpha(x)u(x)),$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $|\alpha| \leq m$, $a_\alpha \in C(\Omega, \mathcal{L}(H, H^\sharp))$.

3. MULTIDIMENSIONAL FRAMEWORK

We shall restrict our analysis to the case $E(W) \equiv 0$ to simplify the computations, but our results easily extend to the case of $E(\cdot) \in Lip(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$.

3.1. Decoupled system. We will consider the following semilinear system of equations

$$(3.1) \quad W_t(x, t) + A(x, D)W(x, t) = B(x, W(x, t)) + D(W(x, t))$$

where $t \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $W \in \mathbb{R}^N$. We assume the following hypotheses hold.

- (A.1) $B(\cdot, \cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^{d+N}, \mathbb{R}^N)$, $D(\cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$
- (A.2) $A(x, D) \in OPS^1$, the system (3.1) is hyperbolic, namely the principal symbol of $A(x, D)$ is the matrix $A(x, \xi) \in \mathcal{M}_{N \times N}$ whose eigenvalues for $(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $\xi \neq 0$ are pure imaginary,
- (A.3) denote by $S = \text{span} \{B(x, W) \mid (x, W) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+N}\}$ then $\dim S = N - k$, $0 < k < N$.

Remark 3.1. We point out that (3.1) includes the case of the following hyperbolic semilinear system

$$W_t(x, t) + \sum_{j=1}^d A_j(x) \partial_j W(x, t) = B(x, W(x, t)) + D(W(x, t))$$

where $A_j(x) \in \mathcal{M}_{N \times N}$, $j = 0, \dots, d$ and for all nonzero vector $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the matrix $A(x, \xi) = \sum_{j=1}^d \xi_j A_j(x)$ has real eigenvalues.

The aim of this section is to decouple the full system in order to single out the conserved quantities from the others. We want to motivate the idea of decoupling by considering Carleman's system:

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} f_{1t} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} f_{1x} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} (f_2 + f_1)(f_2 - f_1) \\ f_{2t} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} f_{2x} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} (f_2 + f_1)(f_1 - f_2). \end{cases}$$

Setting $\rho = f_1 + f_2$ and $m = \frac{f_1 - f_2}{\varepsilon}$ we get ρ, m satisfy

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} \rho_t + m_x = 0 \\ \varepsilon^2 m_t + \rho_x = -2\rho m. \end{cases}$$

In this way we decoupled (3.2) in (3.3) and we have isolated ρ that can be easily seen, to be the conserved quantity. Now we want to do the same procedure on our system (3.1). Let us consider the hypothesis (A.3), then there exists a matrix $P^I \in \mathcal{M}_{k \times N}$ such that $P^I B(W) = 0$ and $Z^I = P^I W$ is the conserved vector.

Therefore, we can construct an invertible matrix $P = \begin{bmatrix} P^I \\ P^{II} \end{bmatrix}$, $P^{II} \in \mathcal{M}_{(N-k) \times N}$.

Now, for any $W \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} Z^I &= P^I W, & Z^{II} &= P^{II} W, \\ Z &= \begin{bmatrix} Z^I \\ Z^{II} \end{bmatrix}, & Q(Z^I, Z^{II}) &= P^{II} B(P^{-1} Z) \\ D^I(Z^I, Z^{II}) &= P^I D(P^{-1} Z) & D^{II}(Z^I, Z^{II}) &= P^{II} D(P^{-1} Z) \\ PA(x, \xi)P^{-1} &= \begin{bmatrix} M^{11}(x, \xi) & M^{12}(x, \xi) \\ M^{21}(x, \xi) & M^{22}(x, \xi) \end{bmatrix} = M(x, \xi) & M^{ij}(x, D) &= OPM^{ij}(x, \xi), \end{aligned}$$

hence by using the previous notations we can rewrite the system (3.1) in the following decoupled form

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} Z_t^I + M^{11}(x, D)Z^I + M^{12}(x, D)Z^{II} = D^I(Z^I, Z^{II}) \\ Z_t^{II} + M^{21}(x, D)Z^I + M^{22}(x, D)Z^{II} = Q(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) + D^{II}(Z^I, Z^{II}), \end{cases}$$

where by construction $Z^I = Z^I(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $Z^{II} = Z^{II}(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$ and $M^{11}(x, \xi) \in \mathcal{M}_{k \times k}$, $M^{12}(x, \xi) \in \mathcal{M}_{k \times (N-k)}$, $M^{21}(x, \xi) \in \mathcal{M}_{(N-k) \times k}$, $M^{22}(x, \xi) \in \mathcal{M}_{(N-k) \times (N-k)}$, $D^I(Z^I, Z^{II}) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $D^{II}(Z^I, Z^{II}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$, $Q(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$. The previous transformation does not affect the hyperbolic character of our system.

3.2. Structural conditions. In order to perform our analysis on system (3.1) we need the following structural assumption:

(S.1) $M^{11}(x, \xi) = 0$, for any $(x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$.

This condition is natural if we consider system (3.3). In that case $M(x, \xi)$ is anti-symmetric and is given by

$$M(x, \xi) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The same hypothesis is assumed also by Lions and Toscani [27]. It is also implicitly contained in the work of Marcati and Rubino [35]. In fact in [35] the relaxation of the following quasilinear nonhomogeneous 2×2 hyperbolic system is considered,

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{cases} w_s + f(w, z)_y = 0 \\ z_s + g(w, z)_y = h(w, z), \end{cases}$$

where $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $s \geq 0$, with the assumption

$$f(w, 0) = 0,$$

which in the linear case is equivalent to (S.1). An analogous condition is assumed by Lattanzio and Yong in [24], where they study the singular limits for the initial value problem

$$W_t + \sum_{j=1}^d \bar{A}_j(W) W_{x_j} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^d A_j(\varepsilon W) W_{x_j} = \frac{Q(W)}{\varepsilon^2},$$

$$W(x, 0) = W_0(x; \varepsilon),$$

by validating the formal asymptotic approximation in the framework of H^s -smooth solutions. In [24] they set

$$\bar{A}_j = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{A}_j^{11} & \bar{A}_j^{12} \\ \bar{A}_j^{21} & \bar{A}_j^{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad A_j = \begin{pmatrix} A_j^{11} & A_j^{12} \\ A_j^{21} & A_j^{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

and the key structure condition is given by

$$A_j^{11}(0) = 0, \quad \text{for all } j.$$

In practice the condition (S.1) is essential otherwise the only relaxation process would be the trivial one, which relaxes on the null solution. In the case (S.1) is not valid, we actually, do not have relaxation from hyperbolic to parabolic systems but we have a multiscale phenomena which involves the simultaneous action of distinct relaxation mechanisms. To clarify this issue, we follow the formal asymptotic approximations of Lattanzio and Yong [24], namely we consider the scaled system

$$(3.6) \quad W_t + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^d A_j(x) W_{x_j} = \frac{Q(W)}{\varepsilon^2},$$

where $W \in \mathbb{R}$, $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+$, $A_j(x)$ are smooth $N \times N$ matrices with the following assumption

(a) the first k components of $Q(W)$ are zero that is

$$Q(W) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ q(W) \end{pmatrix}$$

with $q(W) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$.

Corresponding to this decomposition of Q , we set

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix} \quad A_j = \begin{pmatrix} A_j^{11} & A_j^{12} \\ A_j^{21} & A_j^{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Furthermore we assume:

(b) $q(u, v) = 0$ if and only if $v = 0$, $q_v(u, 0)$ is invertible for any u .

We look for a solution of the form

$$O_\varepsilon(x, t) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon^k O_k(x, t) = O_0(x, t) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon^k O_k(x, t).$$

Recalling (3.6) we introduce

$$R(W) = W_t + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^d A_j(x) W_{x_j} - \frac{Q(W)}{\varepsilon^2}$$

Since O_ε is expected to solve (3.6) we want $R(O_\varepsilon) = 0$. Thus it follows

$$\begin{aligned} Q(O_0) &= 0 \\ \sum_{j=1}^d A_j(x) O_{0x_j} &= Q_W(O_0) O_1 \\ O_{kt} + \sum_{j=1}^d A_j(x) O_{k+1, x_j} &= Q_W(O_0) O_{k+2} \end{aligned}$$

Set $O_k = \begin{pmatrix} u_k \\ v_k \end{pmatrix}$. The above equations can be rewritten as

$$(3.7) \quad q(u_0, v_0) = 0$$

$$(3.8) \quad \sum_{j=1}^d (A_j^{11}(x) u_{0x_j} + A_j^{12}(x) v_{0x_j}) = 0$$

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{j=1}^d (A_j^{21}(x) u_{0x_j} + A_j^{22}(x) v_{0x_j}) = q_u(u_0, v_0) u_1 + q_v(u_0, v_0) v_1$$

$$(3.10) \quad u_{kt} + \sum_{j=1}^d (A_j^{11}(x) u_{k+1, x_j} + A_j^{12}(x) v_{k+1, x_j}) = 0$$

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} v_{kt} + \sum_{j=1}^d (A_j^{21}(x) u_{k+1, x_j} + A_j^{22}(x) v_{k+1, x_j}) &= q_u(u_0, v_0) u_{k+2} \\ &+ q_v(u_0, v_0) v_{k+2}. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.7) and (b) it follows $v_0 = 0$, then (3.8) reduces to

$$\sum_{j=1}^d A_j^{11}(x) u_{0x_j} = 0,$$

so $u_{0x_j} = 0$. By using (b) and (3.9) we get $v_1 = 0$ and setting $k = 0$ in (3.10) entails $u_1 = 0$. Up to now we found $u_0 = v_0 = u_1 = v_1 = 0$. By assuming inductively $u_p = v_p = 0$, by using the previous relations and (b) we get, $u_{p+1} = v_{p+1} = 0$. Hence the formal limit is the null solution. Now, let us consider (3.1), then, by using the previous notations and by denoting

$$(3.12) \quad M(x, D) = OP \left\{ - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M^{12}(x, \xi) \\ M^{21}(x, \xi) & M^{22}(x, \xi) \end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

we can rewrite the system (3.4) in the following form

$$(3.13) \quad Z_t - M(x, D)Z = Q(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) + D(Z^I, Z^{II}),$$

where $D(Z^I, Z^{II}) = (D^I(Z^I, Z^{II}), D^{II}(Z^I, Z^{II}))$.

We formulate here the hypothesis concerning the existence of a symmetrizer for the system (3.13) in pseudodifferential form (see Taylor [47]), namely

- (A.4)** there exists $R(x, D) \in OPS_{1,0}^0$ such that $R(x, D)M(x, D) + (R(x, D)M(x, D))^* \in OPS_{1,0}^0$ and its symbol $R(x, \xi)$ is a positive definite matrix for $|\xi| > 1$.

The next structure condition regards the existence of a symmetrizer for the system (3.13). We assume here a special “block structure” which is natural for strictly hyperbolic systems (for instance, in a more complicated framework, see the seminal paper of Kreiss [19], Majda and Osher [30] or Ralston [40]). The block structure follows also for non - strictly hyperbolic systems having constant multiplicity, by a general result due to Métivier [37]. Here we are not assuming anyone of the previous conditions but directly the “block structure” of the symmetrizer $R(x, D)$.

(S.2) the symbol of $R(x, D)$ has the following form

$$R(x, \xi) = \begin{pmatrix} R_{11}(x, \xi) & 0 \\ 0 & R_{22}(x, \xi) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $R_{11}(x, \xi) \in \mathcal{M}_{k \times k}$, $R_{22}(x, \xi) \in \mathcal{M}_{(N-k) \times (N-k)}$ are symmetric positive definite matrices and $R(x, D)M(x, D) + (R(x, D)M(x, D))^* \in OPS_{1,0}^0$.

Let us remark that in many applications this requirement will be automatically satisfied.

3.3. Dissipativity condition. In this section we state the assumption on the nonhomogeneous term $Q(x, Z^I, Z^{II})$.

(D) $Q(x, Z^I, Z^{II})$ has the following form

$$Q(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) = Q_0(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) + Q_1(x, Z^I, Z^{II})$$

and $Q(x, Z^I, 0) = 0$ for any $(x, Z^I) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^k$ moreover

(d1) $Q_0(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^{N+d}, \mathbb{R}^{N-k})$, $Q_{0\nu}(x, Z^I, Z^{II})$ is bounded in (x, Z^I, Z^{II}) and $[Q_{0\nu}, R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D)] = 0$. There exists $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $(Z^I, Z^{II}) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$, $Q_{0\nu}(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) \leq -\lambda_0 I$,

(d2) $Q_1(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^{N+1}, \mathbb{R}^{N-k})$, $Q_{1\nu}(x, Z^I, Z^{II})$ is bounded in (x, Z^I, Z^{II}) and the operator $R_{22}(x, D)Q_{1\nu}$ satisfies $\|R_{22}(x, D)Q_{1\nu}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2)} \leq \lambda_1$, $\lambda_1 > 0$, $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_0/2$.

Remark 3.2. We splitted the nonhomogeneous term $Q(x, Z^I, Z^{II})$ into two terms that take into account different dissipativity mechanisms of Q . The former term $Q_0(x, Z^I, Z^{II})$ cares about the dissipativity of Q , and it commutes with $R_{22}(x, D)Q_{1\nu}$. The latter $Q_1(x, Z^I, Z^{II})$ does not commutes but defines with $R_{22}(x, D)$ a bounded operator dominated by the dissipative part of $Q_0(x, Z^I, Z^{II})$.

Remark 3.3. The class of dissipativity terms defined in (D) is not empty. In fact it is sufficient to take Q of the following form

$$(3.14) \quad Q(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) = C(x)Z^{II}$$

with $C(x) \in \mathcal{M}_{(N-k) \times (N-k)}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $[R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D), C(x)] = 0$ and there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $C(x) \leq -\gamma I$.

3.4. Formal analysis of the singular limit. We will analyse the relaxation process of the following system

$$(3.15) \quad W_t + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} A(x, D)W = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} B(x, W) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D(W).$$

Following the construction of the previous paragraph we rewrite (3.15) in this way

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{cases} Z_t^I + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} M^{12}(x, D)Z^{II} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D^I(Z^I, Z^{II}) \\ Z_t^{II} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} M^{21}(x, D)Z^I + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} M^{22}(x, D)Z^{II} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} Q(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D^{II}(Z^I, Z^{II}). \end{cases}$$

By formal asymptotics we are leaded to define

$$(3.17) \quad Z^I(x, t) = U^I(x, t), \quad Z^{II}(x, t) = \varepsilon U^{II}(x, t).$$

The previous scaling has an equivalent interpretation as a scaling of the time variable setting $\partial_\tau = \varepsilon \partial_t$, for more details see [35]. In this way the system (3.16) transforms into

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{cases} U_t^I + M^{12}(x, D)U^{II} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D^I(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) \\ \varepsilon^2 U_t^{II} + M^{21}(x, D)U^I + \varepsilon M^{22}(x, D)U^{II} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} Q(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) + D^{II}(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}). \end{cases}$$

If we denote by (U^{I0}, U^{II0}) the limit profile as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, the formal limit system (3.18) relaxes to the system

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{cases} U_t^{I0} + M^{12}(x, D)U^{II0} = D_\nu^I(U^{I0}, 0)U^{II0} \\ M^{21}(x, D)U^{I0} = Q_\nu(x, U^{I0}, 0)U^{II0} + D^{II}(U^{I0}, 0), \end{cases}$$

where Q_ν , D_ν^I , denote the derivative respect to the variable Z^{II} respectively of Q and D^I . By using the hypothesis (D), the system (3.19) transforms into

$$\begin{cases} U_t^{I0} + M^{12}(x, D)U^{II0} = D_\nu^I(U^{I0}, 0)U^{II0} \\ U^{II0} = Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U^{I0}, 0) [M^{21}(x, D)U^{I0} - D^{II}(U^{I0}, 0)] \end{cases}$$

That is equivalent to (by setting $U = U^{I0}$) the second order parabolic system

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} U_t + M^{12}(x, D)Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0)M^{21}(x, D)U &= M^{12}(x, D)Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0)D^{II}(U, 0) \\ &+ D_\nu^I(U, 0)Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0) [M^{21}(x, D)U - D^{II}(U, 0)]. \end{aligned}$$

In the next section we will find sufficient conditions in order to justify rigorously this formal analysis.

4. A PRIORI ESTIMATES AND CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In this section we consider our rescaled system

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} U_t^I + M^{12}(x, D)U^{II} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}D^I(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) \\ \varepsilon^2 U_t^{II} + M^{21}(x, D)U^I + \varepsilon M^{22}(x, D)U^{II} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}Q(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) + D^{II}(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}). \end{cases}$$

and we are going to develop the rigorous theory in order to get the relaxed system (3.19). We want to show that, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, the solutions of the rescaled system satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} U^I &\longrightarrow U^{I0} && \text{strongly in } L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+), \\ U^{II} &\rightharpoonup U^{II0} && \text{weakly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]), \\ \varepsilon U^{II} &\longrightarrow 0 && \text{strongly in } L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+). \end{aligned}$$

The basic idea used in this section is the assumption of the existence of a symmetrizer for the system (3.4) whose symbol has a suitable block structure (conditions (A.4) and (S.2)). The pseudodifferential nature of the symmetrizer, as we will see later, will allow us to use the properties of such kind of operators (Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2) in order to obtain “energy” type estimate.

4.1. A priori estimates. In this section we wish to establish a priori estimates, independent of ε , for the solution of the system (4.1). To achieve this goal the following hypotheses are needed

- (B.1) $M^{12}(x, \xi), M^{21}(x, \xi), M^{22}(x, \xi) \in S^1$,
- (B.2) $\det \left[(M^{21}(x, \xi))^T M^{21}(x, \xi) \right] \neq 0$,
- (B.3) $D = (D^I(Z^I, Z^{II}), D^{II}(Z^I, Z^{II})) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^N; \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k})$, $D^I(Z^I, 0) = 0$, $D^{II}(0, 0) = 0$, and D_ν^I is bounded in (Z^I, Z^{II}) , D^{II} is a lipschitz function in (Z^I, Z^{II}) , with lipschitz norm α .

Remark 4.1. Since $M^{21}(x, \xi) \in \mathcal{M}_{(N-k) \times k}$ from elementary linear algebra we deduce condition (B.2) is violated whenever $k > \frac{N}{2}$.

The next results concerns the “energy” type estimates independent on ε , obtained via the existence of symmetrizers and via the dissipativity conditions (D).

Theorem 4.2. *Let us consider the solution $\{U^I\}, \{U^{II}\}$ of the Cauchy problem for the scaled system (4.1). Assume $U^I(x, 0) \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)]^k$, $U^{II}(x, 0) \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)]^{N-k}$ and the hypotheses (A.4), (S.2), (B.1), (B.2), (B.3), (D) hold. Then, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, one has*

- (i) *for all $T > 0$, there exists $M(T) > 0$, independent from ε , such that*

$$\|U^{II}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])} \leq M(T) \text{ and } \sup_{[0, T]} \|\varepsilon U^{II}(\cdot, t)\| \leq M(T),$$
- (ii) $\{\varepsilon^2 U_t^{II}\}$ *is relatively compact in* $H_{loc}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$,
- (iii) $\{U^I\}$ *is uniformly bounded, with respect to ε , in* $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$, *namely*
for all $T > 0$, there exists $M(T) > 0$, independent from ε , such that

$$\sup_{[0, T]} \|U^I(\cdot, t)\| \leq M(T).$$

Proof. To simplify our notation, we set

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} U^I \\ U^{II} \end{bmatrix}, \quad U^\varepsilon = \begin{bmatrix} U^I \\ \varepsilon U^{II} \end{bmatrix}, \quad F = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D^I(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) \\ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} Q(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) + D^{II}(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$M^\varepsilon(x, D) = OP \left\{ - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M^{12}(x, \xi) \\ M^{21}(x, \xi) & \varepsilon M^{22}(x, \xi) \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

By using the Theorem 2.2, let $R(x, D)$ be the symmetrizer given by the hypotheses (A.4), (S.2), then there exists $\tilde{R} = R \bmod OPS^{-\infty}$, with $\tilde{R} \geq \eta I > 0$. So we can write $\tilde{R} = R + T$, $T \in OPS^{-\infty}$, where by the block structure of $R(x, D)$, $T(x, \xi)$ takes the following form $T(x, \xi) = \begin{pmatrix} T_{11}(x, \xi) & 0 \\ 0 & T_{22}(x, \xi) \end{pmatrix}$. Hence it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} (\tilde{R}(x, D) U^\varepsilon, U^\varepsilon)_2 &= (\tilde{R}(x, D) U_t^\varepsilon, U^\varepsilon)_2 + (\tilde{R}(x, D) U^\varepsilon, U_t^\varepsilon)_2 \\ &= (\tilde{R}(x, D) (M^\varepsilon(x, D) U + F), U)_2 + (\tilde{R}(x, D) U, M^\varepsilon(x, D) U + F)_2 \\ &= ((\tilde{R}(x, D) M^\varepsilon(x, D) + (\tilde{R}(x, D) M^\varepsilon(x, D))^*) U, U)_2 \\ &\quad + 2(\tilde{R}(x, D) F, U)_2 = I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate separately I_1 and I_2 . By applying Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 and by using the hypothesis (A.4) for I_1 we get

$$I_1 \leq 2 \|U^{II}\| \|U^I\| + \varepsilon \|U^{II}\|^2.$$

Let us focus our attention on I_2 , then one has

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= (\tilde{R}(x, D) D(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}), U)_2 + (\tilde{R}(x, D) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varepsilon^{-1} Q(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) \end{pmatrix}, U)_2 \\ &= (\varepsilon^{-1} D^I(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}), (R_{11}(x, D) + T_{11}(x, D)) U^I)_2 \\ &\quad + (D^{II}(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}), (R_{22}(x, D) + T_{22}(x, D)) U^{II})_2 \\ &\quad + (\varepsilon^{-1} R_{22}(x, D) Q(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}), U^{II})_2 + (\varepsilon^{-1} T_{22}(x, D) Q(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}), U^{II})_2 \\ &= I_{2,1} + I_{2,2} + I_{2,3} + I_{2,4}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $I_{2,1}$ and $I_{2,2}$ we use hypothesis (B.4) and we get

$$I_{2,1} + I_{2,2} \leq \alpha \|U^{II}\| \|U^I\| + \alpha \varepsilon \|U^{II}\|^2.$$

Now we turn to $I_{2,3}$. Let us denote by $\bar{Q}_\nu = \int_0^1 Q_\nu(x, U^I, \varepsilon \theta U^{II}) d\theta$, then we can rewrite $I_{2,3}$ in the following way

$$I_{2,3} = (R_{22}(x, D) \bar{Q}_{0\nu} U^{II}, U^{II})_2 + (R_{22}(x, D) \bar{Q}_{1\nu} U^{II}, U^{II})_2 = I_{2,31} + I_{2,32}.$$

From (d1), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2,31} &= (R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D) \bar{Q}_{0\nu} U^{II}, R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D) U^{II})_2 = (\bar{Q}_{0\nu} R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D) U^{II}, R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D) U^{II})_2 \\ &\leq -\lambda_0 \|U^{II}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By using (d2) we get

$$I_{2,32} = (R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D) \bar{Q}_{1\nu} U^{II}, R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D) U^{II})_2 \leq \lambda_1 \|U^{II}\|^2 \leq \frac{\lambda_0}{2} \|U^{II}\|^2,$$

hence

$$I_{2,3} = -\frac{\lambda_0}{2} \|U^{II}\|^2.$$

Now it remains to estimate $I_{2,4}$. For any $\delta_1 > 0$ we have

$$I_{2,4} \leq \delta_1 \|U^{II}\|^2 + \frac{c'}{\delta_1} \|U^{II}\|_{H^{-1}}^2$$

By adding I_1 , I_2 , for all $\delta_1 > 0$, $\delta_2 > 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(R(x, D)U^\varepsilon, U^\varepsilon)_2 &\leq (2 + \alpha)\|U^{II}\|\|U^I\| + \varepsilon(\alpha + 1)\|U^{II}\|^2 - \frac{\lambda_0}{2}\|U^{II}\|^2 \\ &\quad + \delta_1\|U^{II}\|^2 + \frac{c'}{\delta_1}\|U^{II}\|_{H^{-1}}^2 \\ &\leq (\delta_1 + \delta_2)\|U^{II}\|^2 + \frac{2 + \alpha}{\delta_2}\|U^I\|^2 + \varepsilon(\alpha + 1)\|U^{II}\|^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{\lambda_0}{2}\|U^{II}\|^2 + \frac{c'}{\delta_1}\|U^{II}\|_{H^{-1}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

If we choose $\varepsilon < \frac{\lambda_0}{8(\alpha + 1)}$ and $(\delta_1 + \delta_2) < \frac{\lambda_0}{8}$ it follows

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{d}{dt}(R(x, D)U^\varepsilon, U^\varepsilon)_2 \leq -\frac{\lambda_0}{4}\|U^{II}\|^2 + c\|U^I\|^2 + c\|U^{II}\|_{H^{-1}}^2.$$

Let us denote by

$$(4.3) \quad E(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varepsilon^2 |U^{II}(x, t)|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |U^I(x, t)|^2 dx.$$

By the second equation of the system (4.1) and by the smoothness of the coefficients we get the following estimate

$$\|U^{II}\|_{H^{-1}}^2 \leq c\sqrt{E(t)}.$$

By integrating (4.2) on $[0, t]$ we obtain the energy $E(t)$ satisfies the following inequality

$$(4.4) \quad E(t) \leq E(0) - \frac{\lambda_0}{4} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |U^{II}(x, s)|^2 dx ds + c \int_0^t E(s) ds$$

for some $c > 0$, then by applying the Gronwall's lemma, we have

$$(4.5) \quad E(t) \leq E(0)e^{ct},$$

and

$$(4.6) \quad \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |U^{II}|^2 dx ds \leq E(0) (e^{ct} + 2).$$

We can conclude that for any $T > 0$ there exists $M(T) > 0$, independent from ε , such that

$$\|U^{II}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])} \leq M(T), \quad \sup_{[0, T]} \|U^{II}(\cdot, t)\| \leq M(T), \quad \sup_{[0, T]} \|U^I(\cdot, t)\| \leq M(T).$$

In this way we proved (i) and (iii). Let us consider ω relatively compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varepsilon^2 U_t^{II}\|_{H^{-1}(\omega)} &= \sup_{\|\phi\|_{H_0^1(\omega)}=1} |\langle \varepsilon^2 U_t^{II}, \phi \rangle| = \sup_{\|\phi\|_{H_0^1(\omega)}=1} \left| \iint \varepsilon^2 U^{II} \phi_t dx dt \right| \\ &\leq \varepsilon^2 \sup_{\|\phi\|_{H_0^1(\omega)}=1} (\|U^{II}\| \|\phi_t\|) \leq M(T) \varepsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 4.3. If there exists a way to control $\|Q_\nu\|_{Lip}$ we do not need any assumption (D) but to estimate $I_{2,3}$ it is sufficient to have for any $(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$, $Q_\nu(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) \leq -\lambda I$, $\lambda > 0$. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} I_{2,3} &= (R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D)\bar{Q}_\nu U^{II}, R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D)U^{II})_2 \\ &= (\bar{Q}_\nu R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D)U^{II}, R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D)U^{II})_2 + ([R_{22}^{1/2}(x, D), \bar{Q}_\nu]U^{II}, U^{II})_2, \end{aligned}$$

then by taking into account the Proposition 2.3 and the dissipative condition on $Q_\nu(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II})$, we have

$$I_{2,3} \leq -\frac{\lambda}{2}\|U^{II}\|^2 + c\|U^{II}\|_{H^{-1}}^2.$$

which lead to the energy inequality (4.4).

4.2. Strong convergence analysis. We begin with an immediate consequence of (i) and (ii) in the Theorem (4.2).

Theorem 4.4. *Let us consider the solution $\{U^{II}\}$ of the Cauchy problem for system (4.1). Assume $U^I(x, 0) \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)]^k$, $U^{II}(x, 0) \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)]^{N-k}$ and moreover the hypotheses (A.4), (S.2), (B.1), (B.2), (B.3), (D) hold. Then there exists $U^{II0} \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])]^{N-k}$, such that, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, one has (extracting eventually a subsequence)*

$$(4.7) \quad U^{II} \rightharpoonup U^{II0} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])$$

$$(4.8) \quad \varepsilon U^{II} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in } L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$$

$$(4.9) \quad \{\varepsilon^2 U_t^{II}\} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } H_{loc}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+).$$

Our next step is to prove the strong convergence for the sequence $\{U^I\}$ in the norm of $L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$. For this purpose we only use the estimates obtained in the previous section. Our main tool in the limit process will be Tartar's and Gérard's Theorem 2.4, [46], [11].

Theorem 4.5. *Let us consider the solution $\{U^I\}$, of the Cauchy problem for system (4.1). Assume $U^I(x, 0) \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)]^k$, $U^{II}(x, 0) \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)]^{N-k}$ and the hypotheses (A.4), (S.2), (B.1), (B.2), (B.3), (D) hold. Then there exists $U^{I0} \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])]^k$, such that, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, one has (extracting eventually subsequences)*

$$(4.10) \quad U^I \longrightarrow U^{I0} \quad \text{strongly in } L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$$

Proof. By using the hypothesis (D), $\bar{Q}_\nu(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II})$ is uniformly bounded in L^∞ then $\varepsilon^{-1}Q_\nu(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) = \bar{Q}_\nu(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II})U^{II}$ is uniformly bounded in L^2 , therefore $\varepsilon^{-1}Q_\nu(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II})$ is relatively compact in H_{loc}^{-1} . In a similar way, thanks to the conditions on the function $D(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II})$, we get $\varepsilon^{-1}D^I(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II})$ and $D^{II}(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II})$ relatively compact in H_{loc}^{-1} . Now by using the identities

$$\begin{aligned} U_t^I + M^{12}(x, D)U^{II} &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon}D^I(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) \\ M^{21}(x, D)U^I &= \frac{1}{\varepsilon}Q(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) + D^{II}(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) - \varepsilon^2 U_t^{II} - \varepsilon M^{22}(x, D)U^{II} \end{aligned}$$

and by taking into account the a priori estimates and the smoothness of the coefficients of the system, we can conclude

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{pmatrix} U_t^I + M^{12}(x, D)U^{II} \\ M^{21}(x, D)U^I \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{is relatively compact in } (H_{loc}^{-1})^2.$$

Since the symbols $M^{ij}(x, \xi)$ are polihomogeneous in the sense of the Section 2, we can decompose the operator $M^{ij}(x, D)$ in the following way,

$$(4.12) \quad M^{ij}(x, D) = M_1^{ij}(x, D) + M_r^{ij}(x, D),$$

where $M_1^{ij}(x, D) \in OPS^1$, while $M_r^{ij}(x, D) \in OPS^0$. By applying the Theorem 2.1 and by the decomposition (4.12) we get

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{pmatrix} U_t^I + M_1^{12}(x, D)U^{II} \\ M_1^{21}(x, D)U^I \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{is relatively compact in } (H_{loc}^{-1})^2.$$

In order to fit into the framework of the Theorem 2.4 we set

$$P \begin{bmatrix} U^I \\ U^{II} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{k \times k} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \partial_t \begin{bmatrix} U^I \\ U^{II} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & M_1^{12}(x, D) \\ M_1^{21}(x, D) & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U^I \\ U^{II} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The principal symbol of P is given by

$$p(x, \xi) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{k \times k} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \xi_0 + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & M_1^{12}(x, \xi') \\ M_1^{21}(x, \xi') & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

for any $\xi = (\xi', \xi_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, $|\xi| = 1$. We notice that

$$p(x, \xi) \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \\ \mu \end{bmatrix} = 0 \iff \begin{cases} \xi_0 \lambda + M_1^{12}(x, \xi') \mu = 0 \\ M_1^{21}(x, \xi') \lambda = 0 \end{cases}$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$.

Now if $\xi' = 0$ then $\xi_0 \neq 0$ and so $\lambda = 0$, otherwise if $\xi' \neq 0$ by using the hypothesis (B.2) we get $\lambda = 0$. Therefore we get

$$\left\{ (x, \xi, \lambda, \mu) \text{ such that } p(x, \xi) \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \\ \mu \end{bmatrix} = 0 \right\} \subset \{ \lambda \mid \lambda = 0 \}.$$

We take now

$$q(x) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{k \times k} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and for all $\xi \neq 0$, $\xi = (\xi_0, \xi')$ we have

$$p(x, \xi) \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \\ \mu \end{bmatrix} = 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad \langle q(x) \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \\ \mu \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \\ \mu \end{bmatrix} \rangle = 0$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{N-k}$.

Now we can apply Theorem (2.4) of Gérard and we conclude that for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |U^I(x, t)|^2 \varphi(x, t) dx dt \longrightarrow \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |U^{I0}(x, t)|^2 \varphi(x, t) dx dt$$

where U^{I0} denotes, in view of Theorem (4.2) the weak limit of U^I in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$.

In this way we obtain

$$U^I \longrightarrow U^{I0} \quad \text{strongly in } L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+).$$

□

Corollary 4.6. *Assume that the hypotheses of Theorems (4.4), (4.5) hold, then (U^{I0}, U^{II0}) verifies the following system, in the sense of distributions,*

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{cases} U_t^{I0} + M^{12}(x, D)U^{II0} = D_\nu^I(U^{I0}, 0)U^{II0} \\ M^{21}(x, D)U^{I0} = Q_\nu(x, U^{I0}, 0)U^{II0} + D^{II}(U^{I0}, 0). \end{cases}$$

Proof. By taking into account the regularity hypothesis on Q , the strong convergence of $\{U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}\}$ in L_{loc}^2 and the weak convergence of U^{II} , we get

$$\varepsilon^{-1}Q_\nu(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) \rightharpoonup Q_\nu(x, U^{I0}, 0)U^{II0} \quad \text{weakly in } L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+).$$

In a similar way we have

$$\varepsilon^{-1}D^I(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) \rightharpoonup D_\nu^I(U^{I0}, 0)U^{II0} \quad \text{weakly in } L_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+).$$

Therefore we can pass into the limit the other terms and we obtain the relations (4.14). $\square$

Remark 4.7. We can weakly relax the assumption concerning the polihomogeneity of our symbols by assuming directly the decomposition (4.12)

4.3. Parabolicity condition. Let us restrict our attention to the differential operator case, namely (1.1) takes the form

$$W_t + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^d A_j(x) \partial_j W = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} B(x, W) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D(W).$$

In this case the identities (4.14) become

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{cases} U_t^{I0} + \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{12}(x) \partial_j U^{II0} = D_\nu^I(U^{I0}, 0)U^{II0} \\ \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{21}(x) \partial_j U^{I0} = Q_\nu(x, U^{I0}, 0)U^{II0} + D^{II}(U^{I0}, 0), \end{cases}$$

which is equivalent to write (where we set $U = U^{I0}$)

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & U_t + \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{12}(x) \partial_j \left(Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0) \sum_{k=1}^d M_k^{21}(x) \partial_k U \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{12}(x) \partial_j (Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0) D^{II}(U, 0)) \\ &+ D_\nu^I(U, 0) Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0) \left[\sum_{k=1}^d M_k^{21}(x) \partial_k U - D^{II}(U, 0) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We want to show, in this simpler case, that (4.16) is parabolic in the sense of Petrowski as recalled in the Section 2. Taking into account the notations of Section 2, one has

$$L = M^{12}(x, \xi) Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0) M^{21}(x, \xi) \in S_{1,0}^2,$$

where $M^{12}(x, \xi) = i \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{12}(x) \xi_j$ and $M^{21}(x, \xi) = i \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{21}(x) \xi_j$. We are going to show the existence of a positive matrix P_0 such that $P_0 L + L^* P_0$ is negative definite. By the definition of symmetrizer for the system (3.4) we know the following relations between the blocks of $R(x, \xi)$ and the coefficients of the system (3.4)

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{aligned} R_{11}(x, \xi) M^{12}(x, \xi) &= (M^{21}(x, \xi))^T R_{22}(x, \xi), \\ R_{22}(x, \xi) M^{21}(x, \xi) &= (M^{12}(x, \xi))^T R_{11}(x, \xi). \end{aligned}$$

Now let us denote by

$$P_0 = R_{11}(x, \xi),$$

we have to prove

$$P_0 L + L^* P_0 \leq -\beta I \quad \beta > 0.$$

By using the relations (4.17) and the condition (D) it follows

$$\begin{aligned} ((P_0 L + L^* P_0) \eta, \eta) &= (R_{22}(x, \xi) M^{12}(x, \xi) Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0) M^{21}(x, \xi) \eta, \eta) \\ &\quad + (M^{21}(x, \xi))^T (Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0))^T (M^{12}(x, \xi))^T R_{11}(x, \xi) \eta, \eta) \\ &= ((M^{21}(x, \xi))^T (R_{22}(x, \xi) Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0) \eta, \eta) \\ &\quad + ((Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0))^T R_{22}(x, \xi)) M^{21}(x, \xi) \eta, \eta) \\ &\leq -\lambda_0 |M^{21}(x, \xi) \eta|^2 \leq -\beta |\eta|^2 \end{aligned}$$

with $\beta > 0$, this is the notion of parabolicity introduced in the Section 2.

5. THE CONSTANT COEFFICIENTS CASE

In this section we want to show how in the case of constant coefficient differential semilinear systems our theory can be easily simplified. First we remark that in this case we don't need to use pseudodifferential theory because of the constant coefficient we can handle them with classical methods. We point out that also in this case we will assume the existence of symmetrizers $R(x, D)$ with block structure but since the coefficients are constant the principal symbol of $R(x, D)$ depends only on the variable ξ more exactly it is a homogeneous radial function of degree zero of ξ , $R(\xi) = R\left(\frac{\xi}{|\xi|}\right)$. Then the symmetrizers reduce to Fourier multipliers.

5.1. A priori estimate. Here we consider the following system

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} U_t^I + \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{12} \partial_j U^{II} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D^I(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) \\ \varepsilon^2 U_t^{II} + \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{21} \partial_j U^I + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{22} \partial_j U^{II} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} Q(x, U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}) + D^{II}(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}). \end{cases}$$

with the same hypotheses (A.4), (S.2), (B.1), (B.2), (B.3), (D) of Section 3.2 and Section 4.1, specialized to our simpler framework. Then we have also in this case the following theorem

Theorem 5.1. *Let us consider the solution $\{U^I\}, \{U^{II}\}$ of the Cauchy problem for the system (5.1). Assume $U^I(x, 0) \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)]^k$, $U^{II}(x, 0) \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)]^{N-k}$ and that hypotheses (A.4), (S.2), (B.1), (B.2), (B.3), (D) hold. Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, one has*

- (i) *for any $T > 0$, there exists $M(T) > 0$, independent from ε , such that*

$$\|U^{II}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])} \leq M(T) \text{ and } \sup_{[0, T]} \|\varepsilon U^{II}(\cdot, t)\| \leq M(T),$$
- (ii) $\{\varepsilon^2 U_t^{II}\}$ *is relatively compact in $H_{loc}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$,*
- (iii) $\{U^I\}$ *is uniformly bounded, with respect to ε , in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$, namely*
for any $T > 0$, there exists $M(T) > 0$, independent from ε , such that

$$\sup_{[0, T]} \|U^I(\cdot, t)\| \leq M(T).$$

Proof. We apply the Fourier transform to the system (5.1) and we multiply in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by $R(\xi)\widehat{U}$ obtaining the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} |R_{22}^{1/2}(\xi)\widehat{U^{II}}|^2 + |R_{11}^{1/2}(\xi)\widehat{U^I}|^2 \right\} &= (R_{11}(\xi)\widehat{U^I}, \varepsilon^{-1}\widehat{D^I}(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II})_2 \\ &+ (R_{22}(\xi)\widehat{U^{II}}, \varepsilon^{-1}\widehat{Q}(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}))_2 + (R_{22}(\xi)\widehat{U^{II}}, \widehat{D^{II}}(U^I, \varepsilon U^{II}))_2. \end{aligned}$$

Defining the energy as in (4.3), taking into account the hypotheses, the properties of the symmetrizer and Plancharel theorem it yields the standard energy inequality (4.4). The remaining part of the proof follows exactly the same arguments used in the previous section so it is omitted. $\square$

5.2. Basic ideas on strong convergence. The analysis of strong convergence in this case reduces to analyse the convergence of quadratic forms, hence it can be obtained via the classical compensated compactness result of Tartar (see [44], [45], [39] see also [3]).

Theorem 5.2. (Tartar's Compensated compactness)

Let us consider

1. *a bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$;*
2. *a sequence $\{l^\nu\}_{\nu=1}^\infty$, $l^\nu : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$;*
3. *a symmetric matrix $\Theta : \mathbb{R}^m \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$;*
4. *constants $a_{jk}^i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, q$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, $k = 1, \dots, n$.*

Let us define

$$f(\alpha) = \langle \Theta \alpha, \alpha \rangle, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^m;$$

$$\Lambda = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m : \exists \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, \sum_{j,k} a_{jk}^i \lambda_j \xi_k = 0, i = 1, \dots, q \right\}.$$

Assume that

- (a) *there exists $\tilde{l} \in L_m^2(\Omega)$ such that $l^\nu \rightharpoonup \tilde{l}$ in $L_m^2(\Omega)$ as $\nu \uparrow \infty$;*
- (b) $\mathcal{A}^i l^\nu = \sum_{j,k} a_{jk}^i \frac{\partial l_j^\nu}{\partial x_k}$, $i = 1, \dots, q$ *are relatively compact in $H_{loc}^{-1}(\Omega)$;*
- (c) $f|_\Lambda \equiv 0$;
- (d) *there exists $\tilde{f} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(l) \rightharpoonup \tilde{f}$ in the sense of measures $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$.*

Then we have $\tilde{f} = f(\tilde{l})$.

Now we can state our convergence result

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\{U^I, U^{II}\}$ be the solution of the Cauchy problem for system (5.1). Let us assume the hypotheses (A.4), (S.2), (B.1), (B.2), (B.3), (B.4), (B.6) hold, then there exists $U^{I0} \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])]^k$ and $U^{II0} \in [L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])]^{N-k}$, such that, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, (extracting eventually subsequences)*

$$(5.2) \quad U^{II} \rightharpoonup U^{II0} \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T])$$

$$(5.3) \quad \varepsilon U^{II} \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in } L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$$

$$(5.4) \quad U^I \longrightarrow U^{I0} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+)$$

and the limit profile (U^{I0}, U^{II0}) verifies the following system

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{cases} U_t^{I0} + \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{12} \partial_j U^{II0} = D_\nu^I(U^{I0}, 0) U^{II0} \\ \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{21} \partial_j U^{I0} = Q_\nu(U^{I0}, 0) U^{II0} + D^{II}(U^{I0}, 0), \end{cases}$$

in the sense of distribution.

Proof. (5.2), (5.3) follow from (i) of the Theorem 5.1 and the energy estimate implies that

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_t^I + \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{12} \partial_j U^{II} \\ \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{21} \partial_j U^I \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{is relatively compact in } (H_{loc}^{-1})^2.$$

In order to fit into the framework of Theorem 5.2 we set $l^\varepsilon = (U^I, U^{II})$, then the characteristic manifold Λ is given by

$$\Lambda = \{(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^{N-k} \mid \exists \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \setminus \{0\}, B(\xi, \lambda) = 0\}$$

where

$$B(\xi, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_0 \lambda + \left(\sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{22} \xi_j \right) \mu \\ \left(\sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{21}(x) \xi_j \right) \lambda \end{pmatrix}.$$

By using the hypothesis (B.4) and by defining $\Theta = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} I_{k \times k} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, we have $f(\lambda) = \lambda^T \Theta \lambda$ and, of course, $f|_\Lambda \equiv 0$. We apply the Theorem 5.2 to show

$$(U^I)^2 \rightharpoonup (U^{I0})^2 \quad \text{in the sense of measure}$$

and finally

$$U^I \longrightarrow U^{I0} \quad \text{strongly in } L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+).$$

So we can pass to the limit into the nonlinear terms of the system (5.1). $\square$

Remark 5.4. An equivalent form of system (5.5) is given by (setting $U^{I0} = U$)

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.6) \quad & U_t + \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{12} \partial_j \left(Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0) \sum_{k=1}^d M_k^{21} \partial_k U \right) \\
 &= \sum_{j=1}^d M_j^{12} \partial_j (Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0) D^{II}(U, 0)) \\
 &+ D_\nu^I(U^I, 0) Q_\nu^{-1}(x, U, 0) \left[\sum_{k=1}^d M_k^{21} \partial_k U - D^{II}(U, 0) \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the parabolicity of (5.6) follows the same arguments used in the variable coefficients case.

6. APPROXIMATION OF GIVEN PARABOLIC SYSTEMS

In this last section we want to apply the theory of the previous ones to approximate a generic given parabolic system, provided the Petrowski condition hold. In fact here we reconstruct a parabolic system by means of a suitable larger semilinear hyperbolic system that relaxes on it. Two very large classes of parabolic systems will be taken in consideration. The former are quasilinear parabolic systems in divergence form and the latter are the so called “Reaction- diffusion” systems.

6.1. Quasilinear case. We consider now the following quasilinear system in divergence form

$$(6.1) \quad U_t + \sum_{i=1}^d \partial_i \left(F_i(U) - \sum_{j=1}^d B_{ij}(U) \partial_j U \right) = G(U)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $U = U(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $N = (d+1)k$ (then $k \leq \frac{N}{2}$). Let us denote by $\mathbb{F}(U) \in \mathcal{M}_{k \times d}$, $(\mathbb{F}(U))_i = F_i(U)$ for any $i = 1, \dots, d$ and $\mathbb{B}(U) \in \mathcal{M}_{kd \times kd}$, $(\mathbb{B}(U))_{ij} = B_{ij}(U)$ for any $i, j = 1, \dots, d$, then we assume.

- (C.1) $B_{ij}(\cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^k; \mathcal{M}_{k \times d})$, for any $i, j = 1, \dots, d$ and $\sum_{i,j} B_{ij}(U) \lambda_i \lambda_j \geq c_0 |\lambda|^2 I$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (strong parabolicity), moreover $\mathbb{B}^{-1}(U)$ is bounded on U ,
- (C.2) $F_i(\cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^k; \mathcal{M}_{k \times d})$, for any $i = 1, \dots, d$, $\mathbb{F}(0) = 0$ and $\mathbb{B}^{-1}(U) \mathbb{F}(U)$ is lipschitz on U .
- (C.3) $G(\cdot) \in Lip(\mathbb{R}^k; \mathbb{R}^k)$.

We have the following theorem

Theorem 6.1. *Let us consider the system (6.1), let us suppose hypotheses (C.1), (C.2), (C.3) holds, then the solutions of the system*

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{cases} Z_t^I + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \operatorname{div} \mathbb{Z}^{II} = G(Z^I) \\ \mathbb{Z}_t^{II} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} D Z^I = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{B}^{-1}(Z^I) \mathbb{Z}^{II} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{B}^{-1}(Z^I) \mathbb{F}(Z^I), \end{cases}$$

where $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+$, $Z^I = Z^I(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\mathbb{Z}^{II} = \mathbb{Z}^{II}(x, t) \in \mathcal{M}_{k \times d}$, approximate the system (6.1) in the sense of Theorem 4.4 and the Theorem 4.5.

Proof. It can be easily shown that (6.2) is an hyperbolic symmetric system. By rescaling the variables, as in (3.17), the system (6.2) transforms into

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{cases} U_t^I + \operatorname{div} \mathbb{U}^{II} = G(U^I) \\ \varepsilon^2 \mathbb{U}_t^{II} + D U^I = -\mathbb{B}^{-1}(U^I) \mathbb{U}^{II} + \mathbb{B}^{-1}(U^I) \mathbb{F}(U^I). \end{cases}$$

The conditions (B.1), (B.2) of the Section 4 are satisfied by the system (6.3). Now by setting $D^{II}(Z^I, \mathbb{Z}^{II}) = \mathbb{B}^{-1}(Z^I) \mathbb{F}(Z^I)$ we can easily verify (B.3) and by denoting $Q(x, Z^I, \mathbb{Z}^{II}) = -\mathbb{B}^{-1}(Z^I) \mathbb{Z}^{II}$ we get obviously the condition (D). We can apply the Theorem 4.5 and we obtain that the solutions to (6.3) satisfy, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ (setting $U^{I0} = U$)

$$U_t + \operatorname{div}(\mathbb{F}(U) + \mathbb{B}(U)DU) = G(U).$$

□

6.2. Reaction - Diffusion type systems. Let us consider the following reaction-diffusion type system

$$(6.4) \quad U_t = \sum_{j,k=1}^d A_{j,k}(x) \partial_j \partial_k U + f(U)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $U = U(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$. We make the following hypotheses.

- (D.1) $A_{j,k}(\cdot) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathcal{M}_{k \times k})$, for any $j, k = 1, \dots, d$ and $\sum_{j,k=1}^d A_{j,k}(x) \lambda_j \lambda_k \geq c_0 |\lambda|^2 I$, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (strong parabolicity).
(D.2) $f(\cdot) \in Lip(\mathbb{R}^k; \mathbb{R}^k)$.

In order to approximate system (6.4), we define the following linear operator;
 $B_j(x) : \mathbb{R}^{kd} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{kd}$,

$$B_j(x)(W) = \sum_{k=1}^d A_{j,k}(x) W_k \quad \text{for any } j = 1, \dots, d$$

Now system (6.4) can be written in the equivalent form

$$U_t = \sum_{j=1}^d B_j(\partial_j D U) + f(U).$$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 6.2. *Let us consider the system (6.4), let us suppose the hypotheses (D.1), (D.2) hold, then the solutions of the system*

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{cases} Z_t^I + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^d B_j \partial_j \mathbb{Z}^{II} = f(Z^I) \\ \mathbb{Z}_t^{II} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^d B_j^T \partial_j Z^I = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{A}(x) \mathbb{Z}^{II} \end{cases}$$

where $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+$, $Z^I = Z^I(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\mathbb{Z}^{II} = \mathbb{Z}^{II}(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{kd}$, $\mathbb{A}(x) \in \mathcal{M}_{kd \times kd}$, $(\mathbb{A}(x))_{j,k} = A_{j,k}(x)$ approximate the system (6.4) in the sense of the Theorem 4.4 and the Theorem 4.5.

Proof. The system (6.5) is symmetric and hyperbolic. By rescaling the variables as in (3.17) it transforms into

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{cases} U_t^I + \sum_{j=1}^d B_j \partial_j \mathbb{U}^{II} = f(U^I) \\ \varepsilon^2 \mathbb{U}_t^{II} + \sum_{j=1}^d B_j^T \partial_j U^I = -\mathbb{A}(x) \mathbb{U}^{II} \end{cases}$$

By setting $Q(x, Z^I, \mathbb{Z}^{II}) = -\mathbb{A}(x) \mathbb{Z}^{II}$, the dissipativity conditions (D) together with the hypotheses (B.1) and (B.2) of Section 4 are immediately satisfied. Now, we can apply the Theorems 4.4 and 4.5, then since $\sum_{j=1}^d B_j^T \partial_j U^I = \mathbb{A}(x) D U^I$, as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, the solution of (6.6) satisfy the system (6.4). $\square$

Remark 6.3. The Theorem 6.2 can be applied, with slight modifications, to the more general case of Petrowski parabolic systems in the sense recalled in the Section 2. In fact let us consider the following system

$$(6.7) \quad U_t = \sum_{j,k=1}^d C_{j,k}(x) \partial_j \partial_k U + G(U)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $U = U(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and the matrices $C_{j,k}$ satisfy the Petrowski parabolicity condition given in the Section 2. Let us consider the matrix P_0 from the previous definition, denote by

$$W = P_0 U$$

then, the system (6.7) transforms into a strongly parabolic system, so we can apply the previous Theorem 6.2.

To approximate the system (6.4) we can also follow a different approach by using the pseudodifferential theory. In fact, let us denote by

$$(6.8) \quad A(x, \xi) = - \sum_{j,k} A_{j,k}(x) \xi_j \xi_k,$$

$\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the principal symbol of (6.4) and by $A(x, D) = OPA(x, \xi)$. Now we set

$$(6.9) \quad B(x, D) = OP[(-A(x, \xi))^{1/2}]$$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 6.4. *Let us consider the system (6.4), suppose that hypotheses (D.1), (D.2) hold, then the solutions of the system*

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{cases} Z_t^I + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} B(x, D) Z^{II} = f(Z^I) \\ Z_t^{II} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} B(x, D) Z^I = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} Z^{II}, \end{cases}$$

where $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+$, $Z^I = Z^I(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $Z^{II} = Z^{II}(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $N = 2k$ approximate the system (6.4) in the sense of the Theorem 4.4 and the Theorem 4.5.

Proof. By rescaling the variables as in (3.17) the system (6.4) transforms into

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{cases} U_t^I + B(x, D)U^{II} = f(U^I) \\ \varepsilon^2 U_t^{II} - B(x, D)U^I = -U^{II} \end{cases}$$

By using (D.1) we have (6.11) is an hyperbolic system. Let us denote by $M^{12}(x, D) = B(x, D)$, $M^{21}(x, D) = -B(x, D)$, by using the hypothesis (C.1), the conditions (B.1) and (B.2) are satisfied. It can also be easily verified that the symmetrizer of (6.10) is given by the matrix $I_{N \times N}$. Finally we have to verify the dissipativity condition (D). Setting $Q(x, Z^I, Z^{II}) = -Z^{II}$ we get the hypothesis (D) is satisfied. Now we can apply Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5 and we obtain that the solution of (6.11) satisfy as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ (by setting $U^{I0} = U$)

$$U_t - A(x, D)U = 0.$$

□

REFERENCES

1. F. Bouchut, F. Guarguaglini and R. Natalini, *Diffusive BGK approximation for nonlinear multidimensional parabolic equations*. Indiana Univ. Math. J., **49** (2000), no. 2, 723–749.
2. G.-Q. Chen, Levermore C.D., and T.-P. Liu, *Hyperbolic conservation laws with stiff relaxation terms and entropy*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **47** (1994), no. 6, 787–830.
3. B. Dacorogna, *Weak Continuity and Weak Lower Semicontinuity of Nonlinear Functional*. Springer–Verlag, 1982.
4. R.J. DiPerna, *Convergence of approximate solutions to conservation laws*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **82** (1983), no. 1, 27–70.
5. R.J. DiPerna. *Compensated compactness and general systems of conservation laws*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **292** (1985), no.2, 383–420.
6. C. Dafermos, *Hyperbolic conservation laws in continuum physics*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **325** (2000), Springer–Verlag.
7. D. Donatelli, P. Marcati, *Relaxation of semilinear hyperbolic systems with variable coefficients*. Ricerche di Matematica, **48** (1999), suppl., 295–310.
8. D. Donatelli, P. Marcati, *1 – D Relaxation from hyperbolic to parabolic systems with variable coefficients*. Rendiconti dell’ Istituto di Matematica dell’Università di Trieste, **31** (2000), suppl., 63–85.
9. S.D. Eidel’man, *Parabolic Systems*. North-Holland Publishing Company (1969).
10. L.C. Evans, *Weak Convergence Methods for Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*. CBMS Regional Conference series in Mathematics of AMS, **74** (1990).
11. P. Gérard, *Microlocal defect measures*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **16** (1991), no. 11, 1761–1794.
12. F. Golse, L. St. Raymond, *The Navier-Stokes limit of the Boltzmann equation: convergence proof*. Preprint R01035, Laboratoire d’Analyse Numérique, Univ. Paris VI, 2001.
13. L.Hörmander, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol.I-IV, Springer, 1983 e 1985.
14. S. Jin, H. L. Liu, *Diffusion limit of a hyperbolic system with relaxation*. Meth. and Appl. Anal., **5**, (1998), 317–334.
15. M. Junk, W.A. Yong, *Rigorous Navier-Stokes Limit of the Lattice Boltzmann Equation*, Technical Report, IWR, Universität Heidelberg.
16. M.A. Katsoulakis and A.E. Tzavaras, *Contractive relaxation systems and interacting particles for scalar conservation laws*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris S. I Math., **323** (1996), no. 8, 865–870.
17. M.A Katsoulakis and A.E. Tzavaras, *Contractive relaxation systems and the scalar multidimensional conservation law*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **22** (1997), no. 1-2, 195–233.
18. M.A. Katsoulakis and A.E. Tzavaras, *Multiscale analysis for interacting particles: relaxation systems and scalar conservation laws*. J. Statist. Phys. **96** (1999), no. 3-4, 715–763.

19. H.-O. Kreiss, *Initial-boundary Value Problems for Hyperbolic systems*. Comm. on Pure and Applied Math., **23** (1970), 277–298.
20. H.-O. Kreiss, J. Lorenz, *Initial-boundary Value Problems and the Navier-Stokes Equations*. Academic Press (1989).
21. T.G. Kurtz, *Convergence of sequences of semigroups of nonlinear operators with an application to gas kinetics*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **186** (1973), 259–272.
22. C. Lattanzio, P. Marcati, *The zero relaxation to the drift-diffusion system for the 3-D isentropic Euler-Poisson model for semiconductors*. Discrete Contin. Dynam. Systems, **5** (1999), no. 2, 449–455.
23. C. Lattanzio, R. Natalini, *Convergence of diffusive BGK approximation for parabolic systems*. Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, **132**, (2002), no. 2, 341–358.
24. C. Lattanzio, W.-A. Yong, *Hyperbolic-Parabolic singular limits for first order nonlinear systems*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations (to appear).
25. P.D. Lax, *Shock waves and entropy*, Contributions to Nonlinear Functional Analysis, 603–634. Academic Press, New York 1971.
26. J.L. Lions, *Perturbations singulieres dans les problèmes aux limites et en controle optimale*, **323** (1973), Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
27. P.L. Lions, G. Toscani, *Diffusive limit for finite velocity Boltzmann kinetic models*. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana, **13** (1997), no. 3, 473–513.
28. T.-P. Liu, *Hyperbolic conservation laws with relaxation*. Comm. Math. Phys., **108** (1987), no. 1, 153–175.
29. A. Majda, *Compressible Fluid Flow and Systems of Conservation Laws in Several Space Dimensions*. Appl. Math. Sci., **53** (1984), Springer-Verlag.
30. A. Majda and S. Osher, *Initial-boundary Value Problems for hyperbolic Equations with Uniformly Characteristic Boundary*. Comm. on Pure and Applied Math., **28** (1975), no. 5, 607–675.
31. P. Marcati, A. Milani, *The one-dimensional Darcy’s law as the limit of a compressible Euler flow*. J. Differential Equations, **84** (1990), no. 1, 129–147.
32. P. Marcati, A. Milani, P. Secchi, *Singular convergence of weak solutions for a quasilinear nonhomogeneous hyperbolic system*. Manuscripta Math., **60** (1988), no. 1, 49–69.
33. P. Marcati, R. Natalini, *Weak solutions to a hydrodynamic model for semiconductors and relaxation to the drift-diffusion equation*. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **129** (1995), no. 2, 129–145.
34. P. Marcati, R. Natalini, *Weak solutions to a hydrodynamic model for semiconductors: the Cauchy problem*. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, **125** (1995), no. 1, 115–131.
35. P. Marcati, B. Rubino, *Hyperbolic to parabolic relaxation theory for quasilinear first order systems*. J. Differential Equations, **162** (2000), no. 2, 359–399.
36. H.P. McKean, *The central limit theorem for Carleman’s equation*. Israel J. Math., **21** (1975), no. 1, 54–92.
37. G. Métivier, *The block structure condition for symmetric hyperbolic systems*. Bull. London Math. Soc., **32** (2000), no. 6, 689–702.
38. S. Mizohata, *The theory of Partial Differential Equations*, Cambridge University Press, (1973).
39. F. Murat, *Compacité par compensation*. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.(4), **5** (1978), no. 3, 489–507.
40. J. V. Ralston, *Note on a paper of Kreiss*. Comm. on Pure and Applied Math., **24** (1971), no. 6, 759–762.
41. B. Rubino, *Weak solutions to quasilinear wave equations of Klein-Gordon or sine-Gordon type and relaxation to reaction-diffusion equations*. Nonlinear Differential Equations and Appl., **4** (1997), no. 4, 439–457.
42. D. Serre, *Systèmes de lois de conservation. I,II* Diderot Editeur, Paris, 1996.
43. D. Serre, *Relaxation semi-linéaire et cinétique des systèmes de lois de conservation*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, **17**, (2000), 169–192.
44. L. Tartar, *Compensated compactness and applications to partial differential equations*, Research Notes in Math., **39** (1979), 136–210.
45. L. Tartar, *The compensated compactness method applied to partial differential equations*. Systems of Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, Reidel, Dordrecht, 1983. NATO ASI.

- 46. L. Tartar, *H-measures, a new approach for studying homogenization and concentration effects in partial differential equations*. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburg Sect. A, **115** (1990), no. 3–4, 193–230.
- 47. M.E. Taylor, *Pseudodifferential Operators*. volume 34 Princeton mathematical series, **34** (1981), Princeton University Press, Princeton New Jersey.
- 48. M.E. Taylor, *Pseudodifferential Operators and Nonlinear PDE*. Progress in Mathematics, **100** (1991), Birkäuser.
- 49. M.E. Taylor, *Partial Differential Equations I, II, III*. Appl. Math. Sciences, **115-117** (1996), Springer-Verlag.
- 50. W.-A. Yong, *Singular perturbations of first-order hyperbolic systems with stiff source terms*. J. Differential Equations, **155** (1999), no. 1, 89–132.

DIP. DI MATEMATICA PURA ED APPLICATA, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DELL'AQUILA, 67100
L'AQUILA, ITALY
E-mail address: donatell@univaq.it

DIP. DI MATEMATICA PURA ED APPLICATA, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DELL'AQUILA, 67100
L'AQUILA, ITALY
E-mail address: marcati@univaq.it